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• Icelandic shows (historical) evidence of violating overt verb raising, resulting in V3 (=V-in-situ)

• This is not only very problematic for the *Rich Agreement Hypothesis*, but the worst possible outcome according to Bobaljik (2002)

• Outcome still potentially interesting (=there *is* something to explain)

• Arguably what to expect on Chomsky’s most recent conception of word order being essentially about PF / externalisation
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Two Heads Aren’t Always Better Than One
(Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998)

• Transitive Expletive Constructions
• Two subject positions
• Two object positions
• The verb must raise out of the VP in non-V2-environments
• Multiple inflectional (tense and agreement) morphemes on the verb stem
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Two Heads Aren’t Always Better Than One  
(Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998)

(1) a. **Icelandic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.p.sg.</td>
<td>heyr-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.p.pl.</td>
<td>heyr-um</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Danish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3/sg/pl</td>
<td>hører</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agr and V non-local

T and V local
### Inflectional paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Norse</th>
<th>19th-century</th>
<th>Present-day Icelandic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sg. pres.</td>
<td>tal-a</td>
<td>tal-a</td>
<td>tal-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 –</td>
<td>tal-ar</td>
<td>tal-ar</td>
<td>tal-ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 –</td>
<td>tal-ar</td>
<td>tal-ar</td>
<td>tal-ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl. pres.</td>
<td>töl-um</td>
<td>töl-um</td>
<td>töl-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 –</td>
<td>tal-ið</td>
<td>tal-ið</td>
<td>tal-ið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 –</td>
<td>tal-a</td>
<td>tal-a</td>
<td>tal-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sg. past</td>
<td>tal-að-a</td>
<td>tal-að-i</td>
<td>tal-að-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 –</td>
<td>tal-að-ir</td>
<td>tal-að-ir</td>
<td>tal-að-ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 –</td>
<td>tal-að-i</td>
<td>tal-að-i</td>
<td>tal-að-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl. past</td>
<td>töl-uð-um</td>
<td>töl-uð-um</td>
<td>töl-uð-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 –</td>
<td>töl-uð-uð</td>
<td>töl-uð-uð</td>
<td>töl-uð-uð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 –</td>
<td>töl-uð-u</td>
<td>töl-uð-u</td>
<td>töl-uð-u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Agreement is arguably rich by any standard:
  - [M]ultiple distinct inflectional morphemes (B&T, Bobaljik 2002:134) (√)
  - [P]erson morphology is found in all tenses. (Vikner 1997:201) (√)
  - Agreement is a referential category ... the person features [1st] and [2nd] are distinctively marked (Rohrbacher 1999:138) (√)
  - [A]ffixes are argumental ... three featural distinctions: [±speaker], [±participant], and [±plural] (Koeneman & Zeilstra 2014:572ff.) (√)
Rich Agreement Hypothesis

- Bobaljik (2002:148) proposes the following universal statements:

  (3)  
  a. multiple inflectional morphemes permitted, verb movement.  
      Icelandic
  b. \( \leq 1 \) inflectional morpheme permitted, verb movement.  
      Tromsø, %Faroese
  c. \( \leq 1 \) inflectional morpheme permitted, no verb movement.  
      English, Danish
  d. multiple inflectional morphemes permitted, no verb movement.  
      * unattested

A matter of debate whether the RAH should accommodate pattern (3b), the WEAK and the STRONG version (e.g. Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998, Thráinsson 2010 vs. Vikner 1997, Rohrbacher 1999, Koeneman & Zeijlstra 2014).
Transitive Expletive Constructions (TECs)

- Spec,AgrP available for the expletive
- Spec,TP available for the associate of the expletive

\[(4)\]

\[\text{Spec,AgrP }\]
\[\text{Spec,TP}\]

\[\text{bað hefur einhver köttur étid mýsnar}\]

EXPL has some cat eaten mice-the
‘A cat has eaten the mice.’

\[\text{Det har en katt ete mysene}\]

EXPL has a cat eaten mice-the
*‘There has a cat eaten the mice.’ (B&T 1998:56)\]
Two IP-internal subject positions

- Indefinite subjects prefer the lower subject position (TP)
- Definite subjects in upper subject position (AgrP)

(5) a. Í fyrra luku þrír stúdentar víst öllum prófunum
    last year finished three students apparently all exams-the
    ‘Three [specific] students apparently finished all the exams last
    year.’

b. Í fyrra luku víst þrír stúdentar öllum prófunum
    last year finished apparently three students all exams-the
    ‘Last year, there were three students who finished all the exams.’
    [existential] (B&T 1998:57)
Additional evidence for elaborated structure

\[(6)\]

a. \(\text{Spec}, C \quad C \quad \text{Spec}, Agr \quad Agr \quad \text{Spec}, TP\)

\(\text{Í fyrra, að } \text{pá } \text{las } \text{Jón } \text{ekki bókina}\)

last year that then read John not the book

‘Last year, John didn’t read the book.’ (Thráinsson 2011:5)

b. \(\text{Þegar þú kemur að } \text{pá } \text{verð } \text{ég glaður}\)

when you come that then become I glad

‘I will be glad when you come.’

(Rögnvaldsson & Thráinsson 1990:36)
Additional evidence for elaborated structure
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when you come that then become I glad

‘I will be glad when you come.’

(Rögnvaldsson & Thráinsson 1990:36)

• Various issues with this analysis:
  • Higher subject position for fronted elements (CP-level)?
  • Definite subject in Spec,TP (lower position for non-specific/indefinites)?
  • Rather suggestive of an elaborate Rizzian left periphery (CP-level)?
Additional evidence for elaborated structure

(6) a. *Í fyrra, að þá las Jón ekki bókina*
last year that then read John not the book
‘Last year, John didn’t read the book.’ (Thráinsson 2011:[5])

b. *Þegar þú kemur að þá verð ég glaður*
when you come that then become I glad
‘I will be glad when you come.’
(Rögnvaldsson & Thráinsson 1990:36)

• Various issues with this analysis:
  • Higher subject position for fronted elements (CP-level)?
  • Definite subject in Spec,TP (lower position for non-specific/indefinites)?
  • Rather suggestive of an elaborate Rizzian left periphery (CP-level)?

Spec,Force í fyrra ... **Force** að
... Spec,Topic þá ... **Topic** las
... Spec,Fin Jón ... **Fin** las
... IP ... NegP ekki VP las bókina
(Standard) Modern Icelandic

- Standard Icelandic is fully consistent with (3), V-in-situ “ungrammatical”:

  (7) Maria segir að Haraldur hafi aldrei / *aldrei hafi borðað hákarl
  Mary says that Harold has never / *never has eaten shark
  (Thráinsson 1994:184)


  (8) Ég veit hvaða mynd Haraldur hefur ekki séð / ekki hefur séð
  I know which movie Harold has not seen / not has seen
  (Angantýsson 2007:239)
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- Either analysed as V-in-situ (Sigurðsson 1986, Wiklund et al. 2007) or as exceptional TP adjunction (B&T 1998, Thrainsson 2010, Angantýsson 2011).
(Standard) Modern Icelandic

- Standard Icelandic is fully consistent with (3), V-in-situ “ungrammatical”:

\[(7) \begin{align*}
  & \text{María segir að } \quad \text{Haraldur hafi } \textit{aldrei} / \textit{*aldrei} \text{ hafi } \textit{bórdar} \text{ hákarl} \\
  & \text{Mary says that Harold has never} / \textit{*never} \text{ has eaten shark} \\
& \text{(Thráinsson 1994:184)}
\end{align*}\]


\[(8) \begin{align*}
  & \text{Ég veit hvaða mynd Haraldur hefur } \textit{ekki} \text{ séð} / \textit{ekki} \text{ hefur séð} \\
  & \text{I know which movie Harold has not seen} / \textit{not} \text{ has seen} \\
& \text{(Angantýsson 2007:239)}
\end{align*}\]

- Either analysed as **V-in-situ** (Sigurðsson 1986, Wiklund et al. 2007) or as exceptional **TP adjunction** (B&T 1998, Thráinsson 2010, Angantýsson 2011).

- I will also try to argue for the former type of analysis.
Exceptional TP adjunction
(B&T 1998 et seq.)

- Conditions similar to environments favourable to Stylistic Fronting:

  \[(9)\] \(Bókin \ sem \ \{ekki\} \ hafði \ \{ekki\} \ verið \ lesið\)
  
  the book that not had not been read

- Potentially exciting evidence that V3 is confined to higher subjects:

  \[(10)\] a. \(\dot{\text{P}}\text{að} \ \text{var} \ Hrafnelssaga \ \text{sem} \ \frac{\text{hann}}{\text{Spec}, \text{Agr}^P} \ \text{ekki} \ hafði \ lesið\)
  
  it was Hrafnel’s saga that he not had read

  b. \(\dot{\text{P}}\text{að} \ \text{var} \ Hrafnelssaga \ \text{sem} \ \frac{\text{einhver}}{\text{Spec}, \text{TP}} \ \text{ekki} \ hafði \ lesið\)
  
  it was Hrafnel’s saga that somebody not had read

  (Thráinsson 2003:184)

Subject-type restrictions unclear (Wiklund et al. 2007:210, fn. 8).
Counterevidence against B&T (1998 et seq.)
Indefinite, non-specific subjects appear to be ok?

- Contradicting corpus-based evidence:

  (11)  a. sæluríkið fyrir austan þar sem glæpir **ekki** prifust
        utopia_{DEF} for east there which crimes not thrived
        ‘The utopia in the east where crimes did not thrive.’
        (MÍM: MOGGI-E172E)

  b. Núna ertu á nýjum slóðum, þar sem **sársauki** **ekki**
      now are you in new localities there which pain not
      finnst og allt er svo fallegt
      feels and all is so beautiful
      ‘Now you’re in a new place where there is no pain and everything
      is so beautiful.’
      (MÍM: MOGGI-E2622)

  c. [...] að **hvalir** éti mikið af fiski, sem **sjómenn**
      that whales eat_{SUBJ.} much of fish which fishermen
      **ella** gætu veitt.
      otherwise could_{SUBJ.} catch
      ‘[...] that whales eat a lot of fish fishermen would otherwise be
      able to catch.’
      (MÍM: VISINDAVEFUR-C0V122)
Alternative V-to-C/V-in-situ analysis  
(Wiklund et al. 2007, Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund 2010)

- All V2 in Icelandic occurs in the CP domain, or else V-in-situ.

- Extended verb second (xV2), more liberal fronting in embedded clauses:

(12)  
\[
\text{Jón} \text{ efast um að á morgun fari María snemma á fætur} \quad \text{(Ic.)}
\]
John doubts that tomorrow gets Mary early up

(13)  
\[
* \text{John tvivlar på att i morgon går Maria upp tidigt} \quad \text{(Da.)}
\]
John doubts that tomorrow goes Mary up early
Counterevidence against Wiklund et al. (2007 et seq.)

- Thráinsson (2010:1080) shows that $V_{\text{fin}}$ can occur between adverbs:

  (14) $Hún fór$ $heim$, $sem$ $hún$ $sennilega$ $hefði$ $ekki$ $átt$ $að$ $gera.$
  she went home, which she probably had not should to do
  ‘She went home, which she probably shouldn’t have done.’

- In other words, Wiklund et al.’s account cannot be the whole story.
Ten centuries of verb raising in Icelandic
(Heycock & Wallenberg 2013)

- $V_{\text{fin}} > S-\text{Adv}$ in Typical V2 vs. non-V2 environments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>overt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP-ADV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonv2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cpadv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Only subject-initial embedded clauses.
- Only negation and medial adverbs (defined based on their behaviour in the corpus).
- Contexts defined as follows:

  $V_2 = \text{decl. complement clauses, consequence of degree clauses.}$

  $\text{nonV}_2 = \text{comparatives, relatives, indirect questions.}$

  $\text{CP-ADV} = \text{other adverbials.}$
Intermezzo: *gera* ‘do’ as Tense support in Early Old Norse
(Viðarsson 2009, 2017:157)

(15) *[Þeir] lögðu eld í hús hans ok vildu brenna ínni, en eld�
they set fire to house his and wanted burn inside but fire
górði eigi festask í húsinu, en jórðin brann umhverfis
did not get-stuck in the house but the ground burned around
‘They tried to set his house on fire and wanted to burn him inside it,
but the house did not catch fire. However, the ground burned all
around it.’

(16) *Klarus prestr gerði því aldregi trúa*
K. priest did it never believe
‘(Many believed it but) Klarus the priest never believed it.’

• Arose during a period in which Neg was a head (obligatory V-to-C).
• Lost when Neg became a specifier of NegP.
## Zooming in on 19th-century Icelandic

**Root/V2 vs. non-root/non-V2 environments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haegeman (2004, 2012) ...</th>
<th>Hooper &amp; Thompson (1973) ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central adverbial clauses (CAC)</td>
<td>Asserted declarative complements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral adverbial clauses (PAC)</td>
<td>Non-asserted declarative complements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Non-asserted declarative complements</td>
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</table>

- PACs have a CP-internal Topic position, CACs lack Topic:

  (17)  
  a. According to Smith, a group of Arkansas state troopers who worked for Clinton **while** he was governor wanted to go public with tales of Clinton’s womanising. (CAC)
  
  b. **While** his support for women priests and gay partnerships might label him as liberal, this would be a misleading way of depicting him uncompromisingly orthodox espousal of Christian belief. (PAC)
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Root/V2 vs. non-root/non-V2 environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haegeman (2004, 2012) ...</th>
<th>Hooper &amp; Thompson (1973) ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central adverbial clauses (CAC)</td>
<td>Asserted declarative complements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral adverbial clauses (PAC)</td>
<td>Non-asserted declarative complements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• PACs have a CP-internal Topic position, CACs lack Topic:

  (17)  
  a. According to Smith, a group of Arkansas state troopers who worked for Clinton \textbf{while} he was governor wanted to go public with tales of Clinton’s womanising. \hfill (CAC)  
  b. \textbf{While} his support for women priests and gay partnerships might label him as liberal, this would be a misleading way of depicting him uncompromisingly orthodox espousal of Christian belief. \hfill (PAC)

• PACs (non-temporal) allow fronting (Haegeman 2012:159):

  (18) His face not many admired, \textbf{while his character} still fewer felt they could praise. \hfill (PAC)
Similarly, PACs allow eV2 in German (Frey 2012):

\[(19)\]

\(\text{a. } Weil \text{ seine Frau allergisch auf die neue Hündin ist,}\)

because his wife allergic of the new female.dog is

\(\text{muss sie weg}\)

must she away

\(\text{b. } Hans ist nun sehr reich, weil seine Frau hat ihm viel Geld geschenkt.}\)

Hans is now very rich because his wife has him a-lot-of money given

‘Hans is very rich now because his wife gave him a lot of money.’
Declaratives: Root vs. non-root [± assertion]

- Hooper & Thompson’s (1973) distinctions in Danish (Julien 2009):

  Type A:  Strongly asserted verbs (V2 allowed)  [say, report, claim]
  Type B:  Weakly asserted verbs (V2 allowed)  [suppose, believe, think]
  Type C:  Non-asserted verbs (V2 impossible)  [be (un)likely, be (im)possible, be (im)probable]
  Type D:  Factive verbs (V2 rare)  [resent, regret, be sorry]
  Type E:  Semi-factive verbs (V2 often allowed)  [realize, learn, find out]
  Other:  Often asserted (V2 often allowed)  [complements to (pro)nouns]
Declaratives: Root vs. non-root [± assertion]

• Hooper & Thompson’s (1973) distinctions in Danish (Julien 2009):

  Type A:  Strongly asserted verbs (V2 allowed) [say, report, claim]
  Type B:  Weakly asserted verbs (V2 allowed) [suppose, believe, think]
  Type C:  Non-asserted verbs (V2 impossible) [be (un)likely, be (im)possible, be (im)probable]
  Type D:  Factive verbs (V2 rare) [resent, regret, be sorry]
  Type E:  Semi-factive verbs (V2 often allowed) [realize, learn, find out]
  Other:  Often asserted (V2 often allowed) [complements to (pro)nouns]

• Similarly, asserted declaratives allow eV2 in German:

  (20)  a. Peter hat gesagt, dass er glücklich sei / wäre. (V-final)
       Peter has said, that he happy be-subj / be-cond

       b. Peter hat gesagt, er sei / wäre glücklich. (eV2)
       Peter has said, he be-subj / be-cond happy
       ‘Peter said he was happy.’ (Meinunger 2004)
First approximation: V2 vs. non-V2 environments
Based on Heycock et al. (2012)

- Environments in Danish that typically allow embedded V2:
  - Decl
  - Result
  - ConsDeg
  - Cause

- Environments that typically disallow embedded V2 in Danish:
  - Adv
  - IndQu
  - Rel
  - Cond
Icelandic private letters: 19th century

V2 vs. non-V2 environments

(21) Distribution of Neg-Vfin (V3) across typical V2 vs. non-V2 contexts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>V2-env.</th>
<th>Non-V2-env.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Thorarensen (m.)</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Vídalín (m.)</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Jónsdóttir (f.)</td>
<td>Lower-Middle?</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Jónsdóttir (f.)</td>
<td>Middle-High?</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sigeirsdóttir (f.)</td>
<td>Middle-High?</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Largely consistent with a (mixed) V-in-situ grammar.

• V3 frequency consistently lower in typical V2 (“V-to-C”?) than in typical non-V2 (“V-in-situ”?).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Typical V2</th>
<th>Mixed env.</th>
<th>Typical Non-V2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical V2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BjaThor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811-1819</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820-1829</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-1841</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeirVid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790-1805</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806-1815</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816-1823</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GdrJon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-1882</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883-1887</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888-1892</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-1902</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IngJon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807-1819</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820-1829</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-1839</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1852</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SigPal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-1829</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-1839</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1849</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1859</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1871</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SteSig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-1869</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1877</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:** Data rich letter writers in V2 vs. non-V2 environments over time.
Private letters and newspapers: 1784-1850 / 1803-1850

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private letters</th>
<th>Newspapers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Until 1850</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decl</td>
<td>29% (324/1106)</td>
<td>30% (168/560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>8% (6/75)</td>
<td>3% (1/29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConsDeg</td>
<td>36% (35/97)</td>
<td>23% (21/93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>15% (59/400)</td>
<td>25% (49/195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>40% (136/340)</td>
<td>50% (150/299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndQu</td>
<td>27% (19/71)</td>
<td>44% (14/32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>59% (181/307)</td>
<td>65% (90/139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond</td>
<td>43% (68/158)</td>
<td>45% (54/120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Σ 1-4</strong></td>
<td>25% (424/1678)</td>
<td>27% (239/877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Σ 5-8</strong></td>
<td>46% (404/876)</td>
<td>52% (308/590)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Zooming in on Decl:

(22) Assertion-friendly (A+B+E) 22.5% (203/901)
Assertion-hostile (C_{neg}+D) 44.7% (97/217)
Decl *that*-clauses: Types A-E, O

(23) Complement clauses with matrix verbs Types A-E + Other

a. *og seigið svo jafnframt að þjer ekki álitið neitt áríðandi* and say then furthermore that you not think at all important *fyrir mig að vita verðið* for me to know the price (SteSig)

b. *því mjer finnst að jeg ekki gæti hugsað til að vera* because me *feels* that I not could think about to be *annarsstaðar en hjá ykkur mömmu* elsewhere than with you mum (MarDan)

c. *Mjög líklegt að hann ekki verði maður til að ganga undir* very *likely* that he not will-be man for to undergo * próf í vor ...* exams in spring (AndFje)

d. *mjer þotti mikið firir að han ekki vill vera hjer* (KriBjo) me *regretted much for* that he not wanted be here

e. *þá jeg viti að ðað ekki muni hafa verið aðal* although I *know* that it not will have been main *ástæðan til að blaðið aptur lenti hjá mjer* the reason for that the paper again landed with me (SteSig)

f. *af þeirri ástæðu þeir ekki kunni að brúka Øxi* (LofJon) of the reason they not know-how to use axe
TECs: At least marginally attested

(24)  a. Það getur eingin ímyndað sjer alla þá öröugleika sem jeg hef haft við að stríða, síðan í vetur
‘Nobody can imagine all the difficulties that I have had to endure since last winter.’ (GdrJon-1902-07-31.xml)

b. það meiga víst allir sem að henni standa lofa guð fyrir, hennar hvíld
‘I guess all of her relatives and friends may praise god for her rest.’ (GdrJon-1884-05-29.xml)

c. það hafa allir um þettað skrifað
‘Everybody has written about this.’ (GdrJon-1888-02-01.xml)

• Unclear what to make of this ...
Indefinite (non-specific) subjects

- V3 also attested with indefinite subjects:

(25) \textit{og svo laukur sem mörgum \textbf{ekki} fellur fyrst} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{(GunOdd, 1892)}
and then onion which many not like first

(26) \textit{þared ockar Birki [...] ei verdr stærra, en í Finnmörkinni,}
because our birch not becomes larger than in Finnmark
\textit{þar Greni ei þrýfst lengur, er Birkid sem hiá oss.}
where spruce not thrives longer, is the birch as with us
\hspace{1cm} \text{(BTh, 1825)}

(27) \textit{en því er verr ad \textbf{menn} ei \textbf{géta} fundid upp Dampmaskínur til}
but it is worse that people not can find up steam-engines for
\textit{slíkra Verka.}
such works
\hspace{1cm} \text{(BTh, 1832)}

(28) \textit{jafnvel þó \textbf{grøptur} ecki alltjent \textbf{komí} út}
even though pus not always comes out
\hspace{1cm} \text{(Sunnanpósturinn, 1835)}

- Thus, an analysis in terms of adjunction to TP, where Spec,TP is the lower subject position, is rather problematic.
Landing site in-between adverbs

- $V_{fin}$ occurs in-between two adverbs (arguably not $V$-in-situ):

(29) $þó$ $það$ $enn$ $sé$ $ekki$ $orðið$ $algengt$
    tho that still is not become frequent

(30) $sem$ $eg$ $þá$ $hafði$ $ekki$ $verkað$ $til$ $÷$ $sokka$ $handa$ $henni$
    which I then had not prepared in socks for her

(31) $fyrst$ $hún$ $hjer$ $getur$ $ekki$ $meira$ $aptrað$ $honum$ $frá$ $óregrlu$
    since she here can not more deter him from intemperance

(32) $sem$ $hún$ $nú$ $að$ $líkindum$ $hefði$ $ekki$ $haft$ $ráð$ $med$ $að$ $hafa$ $÷$ ...
    which she now in likelihood had not had power with to have

- Both the higher and lower of these adverbs ought to be reliable as traditional $V$-to-$I$ diagnostics.
Summing up

- There is too much eV2 for all movement to be V-to-C.
- There is too much eV3 for all movement to be V-to-I.
- Innovation of V-in-situ alongside V-to-I.
Summing up

- There is too much eV2 for all movement to be V-to-C.
- There is too much eV3 for all movement to be V-to-I.
- =Innovation of V-in-situ alongside V-to-I.

- ‘Mixed’ grammars the norm under ongoing language change?
- Similar to the situation in Faroese? (Thráinsson 2015:189)

(33)  
Hann spurði, hví Pætur hevði  
he asked why Peter had not read the book  
(Accepted 40.2% by < 20 yrs; 27.4% by all)

(34)  
Har var nógvur matur, sum hon hevði  
Here was enough food which she had never tasted  
(Accepted 36.8% < 20; 29.1% all)
Anything goes?

(35) “From a theoretical perspective, it is hard to consider such an outcome interesting, as there would be nothing to explain.”

(Bobaljik 2002:27)
Cinque’s Approach to T-A-M / Adverbs

- Adverbs seen as functional elements corresponding directly to tense, aspect and mood—some languages may encode these grammatical distinctions by means of verbal morphemes, others by adverbial phrases.

- Cross-linguistic differences as to where $V_{\text{fin}}$, $V_{\text{non-fin}}$ ... spells out:

\[(36)\]

Cinque’s (1999) Adverb Hierarchy

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{frankly Mood}_{\text{speech act}} \mid \text{fortunately Mood}_{\text{evaluative}} \mid \text{allegedly Mood}_{\text{evidential}} \\
&\text{probably Mod}_{\text{epistemic}} \mid \text{once T(past)} \mid \text{then T(future)} \mid \text{perhaps Mood}_{\text{irrealis}} \\
&\text{necessarily Mod}_{\text{necessity}} \mid \text{possibly Mod}_{\text{possibility}} \mid \text{usually Asp}_{\text{habitual}} \\
&\text{again Asp}_{\text{repetitive(I)}} \\
&\text{often Asp}_{\text{frequentative(I)}} \mid \text{intentionally Mod}_{\text{volitional}} \mid \text{quickly Asp}_{\text{celerative(I)}} \\
&\text{already T(anterior)} \\
&\text{no longer Asp}_{\text{terminative}} \mid \text{still Asp}_{\text{continuative}} \mid \text{always Asp}_{\text{perfect}} \mid \text{just Asp}_{\text{retrospective}} \\
&\text{soon Asp}_{\text{proximative}} \mid \text{briefly Asp}_{\text{durative}} \mid \text{characteristically Asp}_{\text{generic/progressive}} \\
&\text{almost Asp}_{\text{prospective}} \mid \text{completely Asp}_{\text{Sg Completive(I)}} \mid \text{tutto Asp}_{\text{Pl Completive}} \\
&\text{well Voice} \mid \text{fast/early Asp}_{\text{celerative(II)}} \mid \text{again Asp}_{\text{repetitive(II)}} \\
&\text{often Asp}_{\text{frequentative(II)}} \mid \text{completely Asp}_{\text{Sg Completive(II)}}
\end{align*}
\]
Cinque’s Hierarchy
All TAM heads potential V_{fin} hosts I

(37) a. Modepistemic (probably)
því það er mál sem ykkur líklega langar að vita um greinilega.
(GunOdd-1890-04-01.xml)

b. Tpast (the winter before last)
Pó eg í fyrravetur vissi ekki, hvað það hafði að þýða, sem fyrir
mig bar laugardaginn fyrir páska, liggur það opið fyrir augum
mínunum nú
(KSB-GudMagn-1844-07-23.txt)

c. Tfuture (then)
hvurtsem er kannski þjer þá væruð svo góður við okkur hjerna að
sitja fyrir honum
(SteSig-1867-03-05.xml)

d. Moodirrealis (maybe)
en þá Nafni minn sá ad eg kannske mundi ná Pluralitet féck
hann allt fyrst um Sinn paralyserad [...]
(BTh-I-GJ-1839-09-07.txt)

e. Modnecessity (necessarily)
Par á móti fæ eg ekki hér það, sem eg þó nauðsynlega pyrfti, ef
til kæmi, til- dæmis hatt, frakka og fleira.
(HB-VAR-1810-10-18.txt)

f. Modpossibility (possibly)
Ég held líka mér sé það skást að hafa svo mikið sem eg
mögulega get um að sjá
(SIK-DomhBriem-1851-07-10.txt)
Cinque’s Hierarchy

All TAM heads potential \( V_{\text{fin}} \) hosts II

g. Asprepetitive(I) (\textit{anew})
   \[\text{í þessum raunum og mótlæti sem gódum Guði nú á ný hefur}\]
   \[\text{þóknast að láta mjer að höndum bera} \] (SteSal-1885-06-04.xml)

h. Aspfrequentative(I) (\textit{often})
   \[\text{tala jeg nú ekki um, þó mig opt hafi lángað til að láta yður}\]
   \[\text{eitthvað fá af þessu tægi} \] (SteSig-1877-01-30.xml)

i. Modvolitional (\textit{intentionally})
   \[\text{ef hann vissi med siálfum sér ad hann ei viljandi hefdi af þeim}\]
   \[\text{haft.} \] (BTh-II-BP-1830-12-05.txt)

j. Aspcelerative(I) (\textit{soon})
   \[\text{Páð sem og fyrst er hrædd um er, að eg alltof fljótt megi sjá á}\]
   \[\text{bak þér til fulls} \] (HB-VAR-1809-01-01.txt)

k. Tanterior (\textit{already})
   \[\text{það sem, jeg nú þegar hef sagt þjer} \] (EirJoh-1892-03-14.xml)

l. Aspterminative (\textit{no longer})
   \[\text{þared eg ecki lengur er stórskuldugr í Kaupstad}\]
   \[\text{BTh-I-GJ-1827-11-18.txt}\]

m. Aspcontinuative (\textit{still})
   \[\text{ef hún enþá skrifast á við B. <unclear>Schon.</unclear>} \]
   \[\text{JohHal-1878-02-04.xml} \]
Cinque’s Hierarchy

All TAM heads potential V\textsubscript{fin} hosts \textbf{III}

n. Aspperfect (\textit{always})
   svo jeg kæmist úr þeirri skuld sem mjer \textbf{altaf} finst jeg ver í við
   yður siðan í firra

o. Aspreetrospective (\textit{just})
   Það er líka miklu auðveldara að sjá hið rétta en hið gagnlega,
   nema menn \textit{aðeins lítí á hið næsta

p. Aspproximative (\textit{soon})
   eg hef nú ad sönu i san frétt ad han \textbf{bráðum komi

q. Aspprospective (\textit{nearly})
   Þar margir héðan eru nú farnir að heiðra vors konungs burðardag,
   svo eg \textit{nærri því sit} ein heima, gríp eg þetta tækifæri að svara
   bréfi þínu með póstskipinu í haust.

r. AspSgCompleative(I) (\textit{completely})
   [... með bréfinu [...] , sem eg ennnú iðrast og skammast mín fyrir,
   þareð það svo \textbf{algjörlega stríddi} á móti þeirri elsku og vörðingu,
   sem hvert barn er föður um skyldugt

(SteSig-1869-10-06.xml)

(BskGrd-VAR-1816-04-30.txt)

(SigPal-1842-06-02.xml)

(HB-VAR-1822-01-28.txt)

(Hst-TorfEggerz-1835-04-20.txt)
Cinque’s Hierarchy
All TAM heads potential $V_{\text{fin}}$ hosts IV

s. Voice (*well*)
   Sú þín tilgáta er rétt, að það sem eg vel gat án verið lét eg dætur mínar fá
   (HB-VAR-1840-08-15.txt)

t. Asprepetitive(II) (*again*)
   hugsa það bætist úr öllum raunum mínum í vor, þá eg aftur sé
   minn elskulegasta, vænsta, lærdasta kærasta
   (KSB-AlfJon-1820-01-01.txt)
Typical embedded V2 with V-to-Fin

(38) því er ætíð meiri hætta búinn þegar að það verdur ekki
therefore is always more danger done when that it is not
slegið fyr enn seint
cut until late
‘... when it [the grass–HFV] isn’t cut until late.’

• Canonical Icelandic eV2 as verb raising to Fin$^0$ in Icelandic, as opposed to
  Force$^0$ in asymmetrical V2 languages.

• The featural specification of finite verbs in Icelandic includes rich agreement
  with the subject (in person and number), completely lacking in Mainland
  Scandinavian such as Danish where there is only tense morphology.

• This means there is an uninterpretable $\phi$ feature on Fin$^0$ that needs to be
  eliminated.
Typical embedded V2 with V-to-Fin

SubP
  Sub
    | ūgar
  ForceP
    | að
      Spec
        | ūdað
      Fin
        | verður
          Spec
            | ūdað
          Fin
            | verður
              IP
                | 
              NegP
                | ekki
              Spec
                | 
              Neg
                | VP
                  | ūdað <verður> slegið ...
Typical embedded V3 with V-in-situ

- Availability of Fin\textsuperscript{0} does not \textit{require} the verb to be merged in Fin\textsuperscript{0}.
- A lower instance can also be spelled out, giving rise to V-in-situ:

\begin{equation}
\text{þar} \text{ með} \text{ svo} \text{ sem ekkert} \text{ til} \text{ að} \text{ sjá} \text{ um, þegar að} \text{ eg} \text{ ekk} \text{ er}
\end{equation}

there with so such nothing to to see about when that I not am
\begin{equation}
að \text{ vinna}
\end{equation}

to work

‘Thereby nothing to take care of when I am not working.’

- Minimalist probe-goal framework: agreement established at a distance through c-command/sisterhood in the default case.
- Subsequent displacement \textit{can} take place, subject to variation, but only if it \textit{additionally} carries an “EPP feature” (or more generally an Edge Feature “that permits it to be merged”, cf. Chomsky 2008:139).
Typical embedded V3 with V-in-situ

(41)

SubP
  Sub
    pegar
  ForceP
    Force
      að
    Spec
      eg
    Fin
    IP
      Spec
        <eg>
        eðd
      I
      NegP
        Spec
          eðd
        Neg
        VP
          <eg> er að vinna
How weak/strong should we make the RAH?

- The RAH arguably losing appeal as linear order is increasingly being treated as “a peripheral part of language” (Chomsky 2013:36)

- In my view, the ‘mixed’ system of 19th-century Icelandic goes against every single formulation of the RAH, except perhaps the one proposed by Alexiadou & Fanselow (2002).
Chomsky (2015)

When asked to comment in the present context (p.c.)

- “[E]xternalization is an ancillary system” the establishment of which may perhaps best be regarded as “a cognitive problem to be solved by the child”

- “[T]here is no alternative to a pure synchronic approach” when studying individual I-languages from a biological perspective.

- “That of course does not mean that we should not, separately, investigate diachronically how it comes to be that the data presented to the child have the nature they do. Same when we investigate any other subsystem (“organ”) of the organism.”
The RAH is seen a consequence of diachronic developments.

Suffixal agreement systems arise via subject pronoun clitics (citing Givón 1976, Corbett 1995):

\[(42) \textit{Suffixal rich inflection implies V-to-I-movement} \]

"systems of rich inflection cannot arise without there being verb movement in the language"

Appears relatively well-established in the literature (cf. also Bybee 1985, Siewierska 1999, a.o.)

\[(43) \text{“Anaphoric pronouns give rise to grammatical agreement markers. These commonly continue to perform an anaphoric function which over time may be lost, resulting in forms that only redundantly express person and number and/or gender. Such forms may undergo phonological erosion and subsequently be lost altogether.”} \]

(Siewierska 1999:225)

- Subject agreement *suffixes* would only arise if the subject was right-adjacent to the verb, in I (=Infl) or C (=Comp):
  
  (44)   a. $[\text{Infl verb}] [\text{vP subject .... }]$
  
  b. $[\text{Comp verb}] [\text{IP subject .... }]$

- However, nothing that prevents a language from losing this property, introducing V3 / V-late / V-final.
Reanalysis of subject gaps with Stylistic Fronting?

- Null subjects were lost in the 19th century (Hjartardóttir 1993, Hróarsdóttir 1998, Kinn, Rusten & Walkden 2016).

- Roughly contemporaneous with the rise of V3 in Icelandic.

\[(45) \quad \text{Sistur þinar biðia baðar skíælandi að heilsa þier og grata af þvi að \ epid } \quad \text{ei } \quad \text{gatu skrifað (MalJen-1821-01-1x)}\]

because \textit{pro} not could write

‘Your sisters ask, both weeping, to give you their regards and (they) cry because (they) could not write.’

- Danish language contact may also have been a factor (cf. Heycock & Wallenberg 2013).
Two systems?

- A variable V2/V3 system observing root vs. non-root contrasts, represented by V-to-C vs. V-in-situ.
- A variable V2/V3 system licensed in the same way as Stylistic Fronting, mostly restricted to modifying sentences.

No easy way to distinguish between these systems, but there is experimental evidence for Modern Icelandic suggesting that young speakers accept V3 in a broader range of environments than older speakers, including declarative complement clauses (Angantýsson 2011, 2018).
Two systems?

• A variable V2/V3 system observing root vs. non-root contrasts, represented by V-to-C vs. V-in-situ.

• A variable V2/V3 system licensed in the same way as Stylistic Fronting, mostly restricted to modifying sentences.

• No easy way to distinguish between these systems, but there is experimental evidence for Modern Icelandic suggesting that young speakers accept V3 in a broader range of environments than older speakers, including declarative complement clauses (Angantýsson 2011, 2018).
Gärtner (2016) emphasises the potentially relevant differences among V2 system types:

- Mainland Scandinavian is a narrow V2 (\(nV2\)) system, restricted in terms of embedded topicalisation.
- Modern Icelandic is a broad V2 (\(bV2\)) system, allowing embedded topicalisation to a larger extent (subject to variation).
- Old Norse was a freer/broader V2 system, allowing main clause phenomena even in “CAC” relatives and “CAC” conditionals.

Similar discussion on German subclauses historically, being “less integrated” syntactically in earlier times (cf. Axel 2007)

EV2/PAC licensors in German (Meinunger 2004, Truckenbrodt 2006, Frey 2012)
19th-century Icelandic: A $bV2$ or $nV2$ system?

- V2 type has consequences w.r.t. availability of a V-to-C analysis in supposedly non-V2 / non-root contexts such as CACs, if $fV2$ or $bV2$:

(46) **Central adverbial clauses: Conditional if**

what helps to be good jurist if one wants not do right

(BTh-1836-12-22)

(47) **Central adverbial clauses: Temporal when**

I expect not to while same head is not on us both

that you agree on everything with me

(BTh-1828-03-20)
Concluding remarks

- Icelandic (arguably) is Bobaljik’s worst nightmare come true.
- This does not mean that there is ‘nothing left to explain’.
- For one, there may still be syntactic consequences of having a “Split IP”, taken here to involve a uPn feature on Fin, and these are arguably just as real and exciting (e.g. TECs) ...
Concluding remarks – cont.

- Having two heads (or more) – or a non-local configuration at the IP or CP levels – does not enforce overt verb movement.
- Merge/Agree-based accounts give us the option of spelling out the highest/lowest member of a chain—or an intermediate (Cinque’s hierarchy).
- The Rich Agreement Hypothesis cannot hold in its weak (unidirectional) or strong (bidirectional) sense. However, it may hold as a soft (violable) constraint, along the lines of Alexiadou & Fanselow (2002).
- The soft version of the RAH is arguably the only one that makes any sense given Chomsky’s conception of linearisation as an “ancillary system”.
“But mere data never decide a theoretical debate.” (Den Besten 1977:3)
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